

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 CARLO GUILIANO CRESCI, ) Case No.: 1:20-cv-00412-SAB (PC)  
12 Plaintiff, )  
13 v. ) ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW  
14 PERKINS, *et al.*, ) CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE  
15 Defendants. ) DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO STATE A  
16 ) COGNIZABLE CLAIM FOR RELIEF, FAILURE  
17 ) TO OBEY A COURT ORDER, AND FAILURE TO  
PROSECUTE  
[ECF Nos. 9, 24.]

18 Plaintiff Carlo Guiliano Cresci is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights  
19 action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

20 On March 31, 2020, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint, found no cognizable claim, and  
21 granted thirty days to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 9.) After receiving two extensions of  
22 time, Plaintiff has not filed a first amended complaint or otherwise communicated with the Court, and  
23 the time in which to do so has passed.

24 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that, within **fourteen (14) days** from the date of  
25 service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why the instant action should not be  
26 dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's March 31, 2020 order, failure to prosecute,  
27 and failure to state a claim for relief. Plaintiff can comply with this order to show cause by filing a  
28 first amended complaint in compliance with the Court's March 31, 2020 screening order. Plaintiff is

1 warned that failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation to a District Judge that  
2 the instant action be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order,  
3 and failure to state a cognizable claim for relief.

4  
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: June 22, 2020

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE